

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are pending in the present application.

The disclosure is objected to for containing certain informalities. Applicants have corrected these informalities by adding spaces to some of the sections cited by the Examiner, as set forth above.

Claims 1-5, 7, 9/5, 9/7 and 10-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Howards Koritzinsky *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,598,011) (“Howards Koritzinsky”). Claims 6, 8, 9/6, 9/8, and 17 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants have added new claims to more fully claim the invention and to submit the following in traversal of the prior art rejections.

An embodiment of the Applicants’ invention relates to medical image management system for managing medical image data. In an embodiment, the invention includes an image data storage apparatus which stores the image data and calculates the date of storage expiration of the image data.

Howards Koritzinsky relates to a modular service system for a variety of diagnostic system modalities, manufacturers, and types. The system includes a uniform service platform which incorporates components for interfacing with different system types.

Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable because the reference fails to disclose each and every element of the claim. For example, claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

A medical image management system comprising:

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Appln. No. 09/910,836

a mobile image data reception device, which is connectable to medical image data storage means installed in a medical facility, having a function of receiving medical image data sets stored in the medical image data storage means from the medical image data storage means and a function of storing the medical image data sets; and

an image data storage apparatus, . . . , wherein

the image data apparatus comprises storage period management means for managing a storage period of each of the medical image data sets stored therein.

In the Office Action, the Examiner appears to mention the MRI system 14, CT system 16, and ultrasound imaging system 18, as disclosed in Howards Koritzinsky, as disclosing the claimed mobile image data reception device. Applicants submit that the reference fails to teach or suggest a mobile image data reception device, having of function of receiving medical image data sets stored in the medical image data storage means. Although the reference discloses a system controller 46 for transmitting and receiving data, col. 5, lines 45-50, there is nothing to suggest that the disclosed data includes medical image data sets. Further, the reference does not disclose or suggest the MRI system 14, CT system 16, and the ultrasound system 18, as *receiving medical image data sets* stored in medical image data storage means. Rather, it is the system controller 46, not the CT system 16, which is for transmitting and receiving data, for example.

Applicants also submit that Howards Koritzinsky fails to disclose or suggest “storage period management means for *managing a storage period* of each of the medical image data sets stored therein.” Instead, the Examiner merely points to the dates shown in FIG. 10, dates which merely indicate the date a particular message is received. Col. 14, lines 57-61. Such a basic display does not allow for the managing of storage period as claimed. For example, there is no

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Appln. No. 09/910,836

further disclosure in the reference which allows for the deletion of certain images based on the date a particular image is received or based on some other criteria.

For at least the above reasons, claim 1 is patentable.

Claims 2-4, and 10, which depend from claim 1, are patentable for at least the reasons argued for claim 1.

For reasons similar to those argued for claim 1, claims 5, 14, 15 are patentable. Claims 7, 9/5, 9/7, 11-13, 16, which depend from claim 5, are patentable for at least the reasons submitted for claim 5.


In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER


Susan Petting Pan
Registration No. 41,239

Date: June 29, 2004